



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/667,811	09/22/2003	Yun Cho	678-1121 (P10742)	2139
28249	7590	10/27/2006	EXAMINER	
DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP 333 EARLE OVINGTON BLVD. UNIONDALE, NY 11553			BOATENG, ALEXIS ASIEDUA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2838	

DATE MAILED: 10/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/667,811

Applicant(s)

CHO ET AL.

Examiner

Alexis Boateng

Art Unit

2838

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 August 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 9 and 10 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1 – 3, 6, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Law (U.S. 5,733,674) in view of Kessler (U.S. 6,119,864).

Regarding claim 1, Law discloses wherein in figure 4, a battery charger for a mobile phone, comprising: a first slot having an opening at front and top parts thereof and surrounded by a first inside wall and a first battery pack supporting surface (Seen in Figure 4, but no elements or description is given); and a second slot having an opening at front and top parts thereof and the second slot is surrounded by a second inside wall and a second battery pack supporting surface (Seen in Figure 4, but no elements or description is given). Law does not disclose where there is no obstruction between the first slot and the second slot. Kessler shows in figure 6c, a design for a battery holder. As can be seen in figure 6c, the button batteries are kept separated with out the use of actual obstruction between compartments. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of this invention that this concept could be implemented in Law's battery charger design in order to save money on

production cost, and to not have to worry about the divider getting broken, which would then cause a lot of difficulties for the user when trying to charge batteries.

Regarding claim 2, Law discloses wherein the first slot is larger than the second slot (Figure 4, and Column 8, lines 9-12 recite that one slot holds a power supply and the other is capable of holding the phone and the power supply).

Regarding claim 3, Law discloses wherein the first inside wall has an interfacing connector for electrically connecting to the mobile phone (Figure 4, elements 102, 104, 106, and 108).

Regarding claim 6, Law discloses wherein a first space is provided between a battery pack received in the first slot and a reserve battery pack received in the second slot, so that the battery packs received in the first and second slots are physically separated from each other when the battery packs are received in the first and second slots, respectively (Figure 4, the two battery packs will remain physically separated by the design).

Regarding claim 11, Law discloses wherein both the first and second battery pack may be removed from or inserted into the charger without the removal of the other battery pack (Figure 4).

3. Claims 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Law (U.S. 5,733,674) in view of Kfoury (U.S. 6,049,192).

Regarding claim 4, Law discloses wherein the second battery pack supporting surface is a planar surface (seen in figure 4). Law does not expressly disclose wherein the supporting surface has charging terminals thereon. Kfoury discloses,

in figure 2, a telephone and battery pack, wherein the terminals on the phone are located on the bottom of the phone (Figure 2, element 202), and the terminals for the battery are located on the back side (Figure 2, element 210). It would be obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify Law's charger design to accommodate a battery pack that does not have a second set of terminals on the bottom, such as the one that Kfoury illustrates. The results that would be yielded would be a slot for charging the second battery pack wherein the charging terminals would be located on the supporting surface.

Regarding claim 5, Kfoury discloses a wherein the charging terminal comes into contact with a terminal formed at a back surface of a battery pack when the battery pack is received on the second battery pack supporting surface.

4. Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Law (U.S. 5,733,674) in view of Kessler (U.S. 6,119,864) as applied to claim 1, Jennings (U.S. 5,954,531).

Regarding claim 7, Law does not expressly disclose wherein the first slot has a plurality of fixing protrusions and the second slot has a main lock to fix and release battery packs to and from the first and second slots, respectively.

Jennings teaches a releasable locking mechanism in figure 1, in which a plurality of arms extend outwardly from an accessory structure (element 36) and are adapted to engage slots in a base structure (element 30). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify Jennings releasable locking mechanism by adding an additional set of protrusions to allow it to lock in

two battery packs and add it to Laws battery charger, in order to provide the phone and battery with a firm and secure connection with the charging structure, to ensure that the connection with the terminals is sustained.

Regarding claim 8, Jennings disclose wherein the fixing protrusions are formed at both upper end portions of the first inside wall for combining with fixing grooves formed on a body of the mobile phone when the interfacing connector formed at a lower portion of the first inside wall comes into with an electrical connection terminal of the mobile phone. It would be obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to make the protrusions (Element 36) in Jennings releasable locking mechanism come out the sidewalls of the Laws charger (Figure 4) to engage grooves formed in appropriate locations so as to allow the user to see that the protrusions have fully engaged the grooves, and therefore a secure connection has been established.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 9 and 10 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
6. Claims 9 and 10, recite inter alia, a combining groove located on the lower portion of the inside wall of the second battery slot, and where the main lock (which is used to also control the fixing protrusions of the first slot) has a restoring force that

causes it to combine with a locking groove located on the upper portion of the reserve battery pack.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 8/07/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. **Regarding claim 1**, the applicant argues that there is an obstruction between the first slot and the second slot. Kessler discloses in figures 5a and 6c wherein the batteries are merely placed next to each other and are not separated by an obstruction. The figures show that these are not obstructions, but spaces for the battery to fit, which is similar to figure 3, item 502 present by the applicant. The applicant continues to argue wherein it would not have been obvious to combine the Kessler system with the Law system. Both systems hold batteries and the Law system could be modified to hold batteries in the same manner as the Kessler system to make it more compact and convenient for the user.

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the

Art Unit: 2838

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alexis Boateng whose telephone number is (571) 272-5979. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am - 6:00 pm, Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Karl Easthom can be reached on (571) 272-1989. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

AB



KARL EASTHOM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER